United Nations A/C.3/65/SR.49

General Assembly
Sixty-fifth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2011

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 49th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 19 November 2010, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Tommo Monthe ..... (Cameroon)

Contents

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Agenda item 105: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

(c) Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

10-64431 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Agenda item 68: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.30: International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

1. **Mr. Rutilo** (Argentina), speaking also on behalf of France and Morocco, said that Cape Verde, Georgia, India, Mongolia, New Zealand, Paraguay, Ukraine and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution, which urged States to ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance as a matter of priority. The Convention was the result of over 25 years of work by the human rights movement and was the first international instrument to recognize that acts of enforced disappearance constituted a crime against humanity. It also entitled victims of enforced disappearance to reparations. He noted that the date proposed in the draft resolution to be the International Day of the Victims of Enforced Disappearances had long been used by families of victims in Latin America as a day of remembrance. He made a revision to paragraph 2 of the draft resolution: "eighty-six" should be replaced with "eighty-seven", as an additional State had signed the Convention.

2. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Comoros, Cuba, Senegal, Swaziland and Uganda had joined the sponsors.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.30, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.35/Rev.1: Human rights in the administration of justice

4. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

5. **Ms. Ploder** (Austria) said that Gambia, India, Lebanon, Mexico, Panama, Philippines and Ukraine had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. Austria had a history of advocating respect for human rights in the administration of justice, particularly within the Third Committee and the Human Rights Council, due to a strong belief in the need for impartiality in the judiciary and respect for the right to access justice and for the rights of people in detention. Her delegation was heartened by the sponsorship of so many delegations. Consultations on the text had resulted in a stronger focus on the rights of women and children and the inclusion of specific references to the outcome declaration of the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and the Rules for the Treatment of Women Prisoners and Non-custodial Measures for Women Offenders.

6. The sponsors had agreed to make a number of amendments to the text: in the fourth preambular paragraph, after the words "(the Bangkok Rules)", the words "as a recent development recommended for due consideration" should be added; in the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "and relevant contributions of special procedure mandate holders of the Human Rights Council" should be deleted; after the eleventh preambular paragraph, the following text should be added as a new paragraph, "Mindful of the importance of ensuring respect for the rule of law and human rights in the administration of justice as a crucial contribution to building peace and justice and ending impunity,"; in the thirteenth preambular paragraph, the words "and shall be" should be replaced by the words "as well as being", and the words "legal guardian or other sole or primary caregiver" should be replaced with the words "or, where applicable, legal guardians or primary caregivers"; in paragraph 8, the word "also" should be inserted before the words "the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner"; in paragraph 9, the words "and by ensuring effective access" should be replaced with the words "as well as by ensuring access"; in paragraph 11, the word "upcoming" should be added before the words "day of general discussion"; in paragraph 12, the words "babies and" should be deleted; in paragraph 13, the words "as well as" should be replaced with the words "bearing in mind"; in paragraph 14, the word "comply" should be replaced by the word "complying"; in paragraph 18, the words "Further encourages States to establish independent mechanism" should be replaced with the words "Calls upon States to consider establishing independent national or subnational mechanisms", and the word "complaints" should be replaced with the word "concerns".

7. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Morocco and San Marino had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution as orally revised.

8. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.35/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

9. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation was pleased to join the consensus in support of the draft resolution and welcomed the focus on addressing the vulnerability of women and children to abuse in the justice system. However, his delegation was concerned at the draft resolution's call for compliance with some obligations that the United States had not undertaken. While the draft resolution emphasized consideration of the interests of the child in pretrial measures and when sentencing a parent or caregiver, his delegation also considered other factors, such as public safety, to be equally important. He noted that the call for States to ensure that life imprisonment without the possibility of parole not be imposed on persons under the age of 18 was not an obligation imposed by customary international law, but was rather a reflection of treaty obligations that the United States Government had not assumed. His delegation interpreted the resolution as reaffirming obligations to the extent that States had accepted them.

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.39: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

10. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

11. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, made the following revision to paragraph 2: the word "education" should be inserted after the words "medical care". She noted that the draft resolution recalled the grave extraterritorial effects and economic impact of unilateral coercive measures in the context of human rights. Her delegation hoped for the broadest support from Member States in adopting the draft resolution, which would act as a strong condemnation of such measures.

12. *At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.39.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

13. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.39 was adopted by 124 votes to 53.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.40: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

14. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

15. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, said that the draft resolution had been based on the outcome agreement of the 15th summit of the Movement.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.40 was adopted without a vote.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.44: Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all

17. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

18. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Gambia, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Russian Federation and Tunisia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution, which reaffirmed the right of all to peace and the obligation of States to protect that right. The text particularly emphasized the role of education as a tool for achieving peace. She urged all delegations to support the adoption of the draft resolution as evidence of their commitment to the right to peace.

19. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bangladesh, Burundi, Comoros, India, Jamaica, Swaziland and Uganda had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution

20. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested by the European Union.

21. **Mr. Nihon** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union recognized the relationship between the promotion of peace and realization of human rights. However, the draft resolution only considered States' mutual obligation in promoting peace and did not recognize individual States' obligations to their citizens in that respect. It was the fulfilment of that obligation which made up the core mandate of the Human Rights Council and the work of the Third Committee. The European Union could not support such an oversight and would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

22. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.44.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Chile, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Maldives, Samoa, Singapore.

23. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.44 was adopted by 118 votes to 53, with 6 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.45: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

24. **Ms. Astiasarán Arias** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the Democratic Republic of the Congo, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Madagascar, Nigeria and Tunisia had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution. The text had been updated to recognize the impacts of the recent economic crisis and included language noting the contribution that dialogue between religions and cultures made to strengthening international cooperation.

25. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Botswana, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Congo, Lesotho and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

26. **The Chair** said that a recorded vote had been requested by the European Union.

27. **Mr. Nihon** (Belgium), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, said that, while the European Union recognized that the issues raised in the draft resolution on the need for a democratic and equitable international order required analysis and action by all States, many statements in the text were selective, presented out of context and went beyond the scope of the Third Committee. Furthermore, the draft resolution emphasized international obligations to control the mechanisms of globalization while omitting the duties of individual States in that regard, a responsibility to which the European Union attached great importance. The European Union would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.45.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,

Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Chile, Mexico, Peru.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.45 was adopted by 118 votes to 53, with 5 abstentions.*

30. **Mr. Parham** (United Kingdom), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that during the Committee's discussion of the resolution on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the head of that country's delegation had made a number of obviously unfounded assertions, including the bizarre allegation that the United Kingdom was responsible for the death of Neda Agha Sultan. That, the latest of many such baseless allegations by the Iranian Government against his Government, was obviously a crude attempt to cover up the former's own misdeeds and brutality. However, the outcome of the vote on that draft resolution showed that such charges would do nothing to divert the attention of the international community from Iran's human rights record.

Agenda item 105: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.14: United Nations African Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders

31. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

32. **Ms. Kafeero** (Uganda), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Institute served as a mechanism for cooperation between Governments, academic institutions and experts to mobilize human and administrative potential. The programmes offered at the Institute were driven by the demands of States. Despite the commitment of relevant authorities, some issues persisted due to low levels of resources and insufficient awareness. The report of the Secretary-General acknowledged the needs of African countries confronted with escalating crime rates.

33. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.14 was adopted without a vote.*

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.11/Rev.1: Implementation of the outcome of the World Summit for Social Development and of the twenty-fourth special session of the General Assembly

34. **The Chair** said that he had been advised that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

35. **Mr. Al Shami** (Yemen) said that Kazakhstan and Mexico had joined the list of sponsors. More than fifteen years after the Copenhagen Summit, much still needed to be done to achieve the goals contained in the Declaration and Programme of Action. With poverty and unemployment still prevalent around the world, social integration policies had been developed in a piecemeal manner, resulting in limited effects on social development. Moreover, the ongoing economic, food and energy crises were undermining the gains achieved in recent years. Against that backdrop, the draft resolution, which was based on the text from the previous year, included important changes and elements in support of global efforts to promote social development, such as the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the Copenhagen Summit.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belarus and Turkey had joined the sponsors.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.11/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted.*

38. **Mr. Burniat** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of position, said that the European Union remained fully committed to social development, as demonstrated by its traditional sponsorship of the resolution in the past. While it had engaged constructively in negotiations, it deeply regretted that the outcome had not met its expectations. The inclusion of references to agricultural policies and their relationship to the food crisis — an assessment the European Union considered factually incorrect — exceeded the scope of the resolution and the Third Committee, as did the discussion in paragraph 6 of external debt relief, which should not be singled out as

the only means of contributing to social development. Moreover, both issues were thoroughly discussed in the Second Committee, and references to them should not prevent ongoing discussions in that or other relevant bodies. Debt relief should be provided according to existing agreed frameworks, and paragraph 6, therefore, could not be seen as reflecting new agreed terms. Under that understanding, the European Union had been able to join consensus.

39. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation had joined consensus on the draft resolution despite the fact that the text could have struck a better balance in addressing the relative impact of domestic and external factors on social development. His Government shared many of the concerns expressed by the representative of Belgium on behalf of the European Union. Numerous United Nations resolutions recognized that the primary responsibility for social and economic development — which could also be affected by external factors — rested with national Governments. The international community must therefore address both internal and external causes of food insecurity in a comprehensive manner.

40. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. However, it was regrettable that its concerns on paragraph 6 had not been reflected. Japan would continue to engage actively in building a society for all and in providing assistance to countries in need.

Agenda item 27: Social development (*continued*)

(c) Follow-up to the International Year of Older Persons: Second World Assembly on Ageing (*continued*)

Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.8/Rev.1: Follow-up to the Second World Assembly on Ageing

41. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee), making a statement of programme budget implications, drew attention to paragraphs 28 and 29 of the draft resolution. The open-ended working group to be established pursuant to those paragraphs would meet at Headquarters in New York and decide on its calendar and programme of work by consensus at an organizational meeting in 2011. The working group would hold three sessions in 2011: an organizational session to be held before March 2011 with a duration not exceeding three days, which would require interpretation services into six official languages for four meetings and three documents with a total number of 3,000 words to be translated and issued in six official languages; a first substantive session to be held no less than two months after the organizational session, with a duration not exceeding five days, which required interpretation services into six official languages for eight meetings and three documents with a total number of 9,000 words to be translated and issued in six official languages; and a second substantive session with a duration not exceeding five days, which required interpretation services into six official languages for ten meetings and three documents with a total number of 9,000 words to be translated and issued in six official languages. It was understood that interpretation services would be provided on an "as available" basis; therefore, no additional resources were required. As for the translation of the nine documents, an estimated additional $131,600 would be required. The Secretariat would seek to identify areas from which resources could be redeployed to meet the requirements within the provisions approved under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and Conference Management for the biennium 2010-2011.. Therefore, should the draft resolution be adopted, there would be no programme budget implications for that biennium.

42. **Mr. Al Shami** (Yemen), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that Albania, Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United States of America had joined the sponsors. For far too long, the issue of ageing had not received the attention it deserved from the international community. The draft resolution therefore called for the establishment of an open-ended working group. While the original draft had included a stronger reference to a specific mandate to be assigned to the working group, the revised version focused on more realistic goals and aimed to allow all delegations to be involved in and comfortable with that important process. As mentioned, the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. As agreed, the working group would function within existing resources for the duration of its mandate unless an agreement was reached at a later stage, by consensus. Moreover, it would not be a

permanent forum on the issue of older persons but would instead focus its deliberations on the issue outlined in paragraph 28. At an organizational meeting in early 2011, its calendar and programme of work would be determined, as would the number of meetings, which would be held at times when no other major meetings were in progress. The Secretariat would provide support with documentation on the basis of available resources.

43. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Iceland, Italy, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Serbia and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

44. *Draft resolution A/C.3/65/L.8/Rev.1, as amended, was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Al Shami** (Yemen), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the establishment of an open-ended working group sent the positive signal that countries supported the promotion and protection of the rights of older persons, as all persons would ultimately age. While the outcome of the group's deliberations remained to be seen, delegations could take pride in the fact that a tangible outcome had been achieved and an historic step in the right direction had been taken.

46. **Mr. Burniat** (Belgium), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union attached great importance to the issue of ageing. While longevity was a positive development, it also posed challenges, including human rights issues affecting older persons. The European Union looked forward to contributing constructively to the open-ended working group, while also considering the existing international framework. He concurred that all activities of the working group would be covered by existing resources for the duration of its mandate, including during the next biennium of the regular budget.

47. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution. It interpreted the references in paragraph 23 to the International Institute on Ageing in Malta and the European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research in Vienna as examples of structures dealing with issues affecting the elderly. Those references did not mean that the General Assembly had granted those mechanisms any special standing or status.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.